



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Eels
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,435	04/10/2001	Martin Morris	WIDC-010/00US	3805
23446	7590	11/28/2005	EXAMINER	
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD			CORRIELUS, JEAN B	
500 WEST MADISON STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 3400				2637
CHICAGO, IL 60661				

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/832,435	MORRIS, MARTIN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jean B. Corrielus	2637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1,2,9-17 and 19-24 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hsieh US Patent No. 6,510,248.

Hsieh discloses an apparatus (fig. 2) comprises an input shift register (shifter) for receiving a sequence of bits comprises a codeword see fig. 2; a plurality of code comparators corresponding to the claimed “plurality of phase synchronizers associated with a different codeword (plurality of potential phases) each producing an active signal (valid signal) upon determining that said input includes a set of bits corresponding to the codeword see col. 8, line 44- col. 9, line 23; a code type arbitrator corresponding to the claimed comparator for determining whether any of said comparators (phase synchronizers) produce an active (valid) signal see col. 5, lines 24-27. Note that the inputs of the code type arbitrator (comparator) are active signal input (valid) hence the output (selected) has to be an active signal (valid).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh.

As applied to claim 3 above, Hsieh discloses every feature of the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach the use of an error correction for carrying out error correction operation on said codeword using error correction information from said plurality of comparators (phase synchronizers). However, incorporating an error correction in Hsieh for carrying out error correction operation on said codeword using error correction information from said plurality of comparators (phase synchronizers) would have been obvious to one skill in the art in order to ensure that the received codeword is as closed as possible to the transmitted codeword.

5. Claims 4-8 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Claims 1-2, 9-17, 19-24 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/12/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is alleged that Hsieh teaches that each comparator (phase synchronizer)

is configured to receive a “different code word” rather than “potential phases of a particular code word”. However, it is noted that at page 5, paragraph 0022, lines 7-8, that applicant’s own disclosure defines “potential codeword phase” as “different code word sequence”. Hence, the “different code words” teaches by Hsieh corresponds to applicant’s claimed limitations of “potential phases of code word”. In addition, applicant argues that Hsieh teaches “code comparators” not “phase synchronizers”. Note that the phase synchronizer as claimed by applicant is to compare two patterns to determine whether they agree to each other. The “code comparator” of Hsieh takes two signals and establishes a comparison. Hence, the “code comparator” teaches by Hsieh is functionally equivalent to the claimed “phase synchronizer”. Applicant further alleged that Hsieh ignores corrupted codeword rather than providing error correction. However, it is noted that Hsieh only teaches it is desirable to contain the error within the length of the code to prevent propagation into the rest of the image see col. 3, lines 56-59. It does not preclude however, the use of error correction code to correct the corrupted code. As requested by applicant, note the US reference to Fujiki, US Patent No. 5,231,638, that teaches an error correction device providing error corrected signal based on error correction information received from error pointer 6 reference.

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean B. Corrielus whose telephone number is 571-272-3020. The examiner can normally be reached on Maxi-Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on 571-272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Jean B Corrielus
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2637
11-23-05